

**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
PARK BOARD
HELD AT CITY HALL
September 11, 2012
7:00 PM**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Steel called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm

II. WELCOME NEW STUDENT MEMBERS

The student members were not in attendance.

III. ROLL CALL

Answering roll call were Members Dan Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto, Steel, Deeds, Gieseke, Jones, Kathryn Peterson
John O'Leary arrived at 7:37pm

IV. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Segreto, approving the meeting agenda.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto, Steel, Deeds, Gieseke, Jones, Kathryn Peterson
Motion Carried

V. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Segreto approving the consent agenda as follows:

V.A. Approval of Minutes – Retreat meeting on Monday, August 13, 2012

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto, Steel, Deeds, Gieseke, Jones, Kathryn Peterson
Motion Carried

VI. COMMUNITY COMMENT

Ann Larson, 5025 Lincoln Circle, informed the Park Board she was bitten by a dog at the Edina Dog Park in June because the owner in question was not paying attention to his dog as well as his dog was not under voice control which it states in the rules. She stated that the owner did not have a dog collar for his dog and in fact did not have any identification tags. She explained the owner was on his cell phone half-way across the park with his back turned to the dog when the dog bit her in the forearm. She informed the Park Board she had to get a series of rabies shots because the owner's dog did not have updated shots. She pointed out this raises some issues that have been ongoing at the park in terms of it does not seem like the park is really policed and rules are not being followed. In addition, there are a lot of people using the park that are not paying for it as well as there is a lot of dog poop that owners are not picking up.

Herb Anderson, 3 Wellesly Place, informed the Park Board that people who do not belong in the dog park are using it and telling their friends because they know it is not being policed anymore and it really is getting out of hand. He asked if there could be better rules and perhaps put a flyer in with the notice when it's time to renew the dog license collars and also saying if you don't pick up after your dog(s) you won't be allowed in the park.

VII. REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

VII.A. August 13, 2012 Park Board Retreat Review

Member Jones indicated she thought the retreat was a great event; however, it was different from what she had expected. She noted that they never discussed the surveys they filled out and asked if they will be given a time to do that. She commented if they were just going to brainstorm a work plan she would have never suggested the meeting not be televised because the public does have every right to hear them brainstorm and discuss a work plan.

Member Jacobson stated that she also wished they could have reviewed the survey results and figure out how they could work more efficiently together because a lot of times she feels they are on different pages and if they could figure out how to corral that into an efficient meeting it would help all of them.

Member Segreto explained since it was originally her idea it really was her intent to work on interpersonal communications but, with all due respect, unless you really are skilled in that field or had some professional assistance from outside it really would be hard for a chairperson to do. She commented that she would like to do that and they do have the survey to work with. She stated it was a productive meeting; however, it wasn't what her expectation was.

Chair Steel replied they certainly can do that moving forward; however, it is a little frustrating because she did present the agenda in advance and she thought it was pretty clear. She noted they can put this on the agenda for discussion at a future meeting. Member Jones responded she is not sure what they would be discussing because it sounds like this is something that is not possible to do without a facilitator; therefore, maybe they could bring in a facilitator and plan it as a non-televised meeting. She added that she doesn't want them to waste their time filling out a survey and then do nothing with it and asked Ms. Kattreh if she could find out if there is someone on staff who could provide some kind of facilitating. Member Hulbert responded he thought that is what they originally had asked for and were told no. Member Segreto replied that is correct, when she first brainstormed the idea with Mr. Keprios he said they had never done something like that before and really didn't have the budget for it. She commented that maybe this is something they could do next summer and maybe they could get a budget line to have a facilitator help them.

Chair Steel clarified that each question on the survey was taken into consideration and after meeting with Ms. Kattreh and Karen Kurt, Assistant City Manager, they identified what they felt were the key issues. While interpersonal relationships is certainly a component there are other components they felt were more important to impacting their work right now which is they need to have a work plan turned in tomorrow. Therefore, if the Park Board doesn't understand their role they are not going to be able to function so she did have to make a decision to prioritize but going forward they can continue to look at the other components to make them more effective.

Member Deeds indicated that he thought the retreat was good and the only change he would make in the future is that there be no "block voting" because it becomes a little biased.

VII.B. 2013 Park Board Work Plan – Keeya Steel, Chairperson

Chair Steel informed the Park Board that she worked with Mr. Keprios and Ms. Kattreh on this and that she would like to go through it item by item.

"Strategic Planning with a Comprehensive Needs Assessment" - Chair Steel indicated that she thought it was apparent that they need more strategic planning throughout their activities and that this item would most comprehensively include the different questions they had at the Park Board retreat. She stated that she really didn't think it made sense to start new programming without having a strategic plan and a needs assessment before investing money into specific programs or facilities.

“Edina Senior Center” - Chair Steel explained the reason she did not include this under the Strategic Plan is because it’s looking at existing data and this has already been talked about and has a \$900 budget. Member Segreto asked what is the \$900 based upon to which Ms. Kattreh replied that is something Mr. Keprios put together and she does not have the answer but will find out.

Member Hulbert commented he believes former Park Board Member Bill Lough was very interested in this and maybe they could reach out to him and see if he has the desire to have community involvement with the study of the Edina Senior Center. Chair Steel replied it does state under Park Board duties it includes former working groups or committees and therefore feels communicating that to him would be very valuable.

Member Jacobson stated she has one tangential question on the Edina Center Study: is it more about the use of the building when it’s not in use as a Senior Center or is it about the Senior Center activities or both? Chair Steel replied she believes both. Member Jones commented that she would like to add parking to the study.

“Cost Recovery Goals for Enterprise Facilities” - Chair Steel stated they did pass a recommendation asking City Council that they study this again. She pointed out there is an overlap with the Strategic Plan in everything they will be doing because it will be comprehensive. However, this will be a little different because again they are looking at existing data and also one of the items mentioned at the retreat was classification and therefore thinks that also plays into this initiative. She commented that she believes the recommendation they passed to the City Council has not been acted on yet and that once the “Work Plan” goes to City Council they will have a chance to review it.

Member Jones asked if they could add a discussion of what makes something an enterprise facility, what are the principles and maybe it should include enterprise budgets, statistics and business plans to which Member Deeds added criteria classification. Member Kathryn Peterson commented that was the point of the classification to try to make head or tail of what is or is not considered an enterprise.

Member Dan Peterson stated that with respect to cost recovery they need to know what is the cost to keep it going and how many people use it and how many people they need to use it in order to recover the cost; however, he is not sure if those numbers are available. Chair Steel indicated that right now it says “review enterprise facility budget” and doesn’t know if that’s sufficient.

“New Initiatives” - Chair Steel explained there were a few more items added and under the “Ongoing Responsibilities” they have their CIP but Scott Neal expressed that he would like articulated separately and she was informed by staff that these are necessary to include. She added all of these items will be addressed in 2013.

“Renovate Garden Park Baseball Field Initiative” - Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board this initiative was brought forth by the Edina Baseball Association. There are some fields that they would like to see improved and first on their list is Garden Park and the plan is for the City to partner with the EBA. The EBA is offering a \$100,000 donation and the City is applying for a grant for approximately \$260,000 through Hennepin County Youth Sports. If they receive funding this is a project they will be working on and there will be action in the form of a public hearing in October. If everything passes they will begin working on the project in 2013.

“Barrier Free Replacement Playground Equipment at Wooddale Park Initiative” - Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board this initiative was brought to them by an Edina resident who lives in the neighborhood and is interested in putting together a fundraising campaign to replace the playground equipment with a completely barrier play structure. She noted they are anticipating a budget of approximately \$300,000 and they do have some matching funds that they can put in their CIP for 2013. She noted this is an addition to this year but they are looking at it as being completely done by the neighborhood’s

fundraising effort. She added they are in the very preliminary stages right now but anticipate it being more of an initiative in 2013 as well.

“Lake Edina Pathway Initiative” - Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board this is an initiative that came about in conjunction with “Do Town” as well as interest by some City Council members in an attempt to try to bridge the Parklawn neighborhood and Cornelia School. This will give kids in that neighborhood a safe route to access the school and the playground. She noted it was added to the 2013 CIP and is something that will take place in the form of a public hearing with the neighborhood.

“Countryside Park Master Plan” – Ms. Kattreh indicated they have been working on this for over a year and are getting very close to completing a master plan. She indicated they will be asking Park Board to review and comment on a play structure to which they’ve been working on the design for several months. She noted that Member Hulbert has volunteered to serve on the committee to replace the shelter building.

Member Jones asked where the one million dollar budget on that item came from. Ms. Kattreh replied they had \$330,000 in their CIP for this year to replace the playground equipment and pathways. In addition, they received \$695,000 in a park dedication fee from the “Waters Development” which is the reason they are able to move forward with the entire master plan.

“Ongoing Responsibilities” - Chair Steel informed the Park Board they have a list of ongoing responsibilities which basically are annual duties as well as a list of work plan ideas to be considered in the future: CIP, Fees and Charges, Donations Policy, Naming of Parks and Facilities Policy, User Fee Policy, 2014-2015 Operating Budget, Edina Veteran’s Memorial, Update Bylaws, Election of Officers and the 2014 Park Board Work Plan.

“Other Work Plan Ideas Considered for Current Year or Future Years” – Chair Steel informed the Park Board of the following other work plan ideas: Cooperative Agreement with the School District; Sports Dome and the Masters Parks Plan, which again had interest from City Council.

Member Deeds indicated that being a part of the Sports Dome Committee he would like to see it come to a conclusion and would like to see it somewhere on the Work Plan with a deadline date and get it done. He stated they need to find a location and make a decision, pick a date and get a plan to present to the Park Board and then move it on to the City Council rather than have it on the “Other Work Plan Ideas”. Ms. Kattreh responded the reason it was put on the Work Plan is because it’s titled “New Initiatives” and this is more of a current year initiative. She stated that she totally agrees and maybe it’s a matter of keeping it where it is with a final date; however, they certainly can move it to the “New Initiative” section as well. Member Deeds stated that he would like to see a general timeframe where there will be a recommendation, review and comment on the Sports Dome on a calendar. Chair Steel replied the Park Board will have a chance to review the calendar but the idea of this is to make sure that the City Council is in agreement with their initiatives.

Member Jones indicated they have several initiatives that are going on right now that they hope to have completed and the Sports Dome is one of them. She stated that in looking at “Ongoing Responsibilities” she would like some clarification that the Donations and Naming Policy Working Group is not considered ongoing because she thought they were done so likewise there will be expectations of their involvement in the future. Therefore, she would not recommend them to be on their Work Plan. Chair Steel replied that is a good point and suggested that they be put under “Ongoing Responsibilities” and move the Sports Dome into that as well and after each item write “completed by such date”. Member Jones indicated that they are different than “Ongoing Responsibilities” such as the CIP, fees and charges, operating budget, bylaws and election of officers.

Member Kathryn Peterson asked if they could put an item under “Ongoing Responsibilities” that says “Policy Review as needed”. Chair Steel replied she doesn’t think that speaks to the Sports Dome and suggested adding a new category “Ongoing Initiatives”. Members Jones commented that she thinks the target completion dates are good and she likes the form for the “New Initiatives” but she would cut the word “New” out of there for the other initiatives like the Sports Dome.

Chair Steel asked if it is the general consensus that the Donations and Naming Policy, User Fee Policy and Sports Dome are initiatives that should be completed in 2013 to which Member Deeds replied he thought some of those were completed. Chair Steel replied that the City Council will continue to work on the Donations and Naming Policy with the Park Board and the City Council did pass the User Fee Policy. However, if they start receiving new data they will need to work on the policy.

Member Jones indicated that regarding the “Edina Veterans Memorial Committee” she would suggest they open it up again to have a Park Board member be a representative on that committee and find out if there is going to be a target completion date or is it going to be ongoing forever. Chair Steel replied that she thinks having it on the Work Plan is sufficient for being able to talk about it; however when they start discussing the calendar they will try to get those specifics regarding the memorial.

Member Jones commented on the “Master Parks Plan” for the “Other Park Plan Ideas” she considers it to be something similar to the Strategic Planning and Comprehensive Needs Assessment and therefore would like to put it under the first Initiative. Chair Steel replied she thinks it’s a little different and asked Ms. Kattreh to explain what a “Master Parks Plan” looks like. Ms. Kattreh explained the difference with the “Master Parks Plan” would be an actual study of each park facility itself and its uses and possible modifications. She explained the “Strategic Plan” is looking at their operations, programming and how it relates to the economy today as well as how it relates to our vision and mission statements. The Master Parks Plan being very park facility specific and the other more operational mission and vision related.

Member Deeds asked if Countryside Park already has a master plan and therefore this is just a plan that is moving forward on a plan that exists, correct? Ms. Kattreh replied yes and added they are able to move forward with that plan because of the Park Dedication fee from the “Waters Development”. Member Jones indicated that she has a different definition of a “Master Parks Plan”. For example, there is a master plan for Countryside Park in existence and there is a master plan in existence for Garden Park; however, other communities create Master Parks Plan and showed the Park Board two examples of Master Parks plan from other communities. One community is a city in Illinois with similar demographics to Edina and in it they talk about a needs assessment and they talk a little bit about a strategic plan and it’s all a part of the Master Parks Plan. It takes a ten year vision of where they want to be and looks at all of their facilities. She stated the other city she looked at was Roseville and they do have the aspects of what goes on in each individual park but it’s a broader strategic plan. She stated that with these two master plans, since they incorporate the strategic plan and the needs assessment, they talk about the process those cities used in order to create a needs assessment in order to create the strategic plan and that might be a good tool for them as they work on the first work plan. She noted she would ask staff to say if there are other cities that have similar things. She commented that sometimes she feels like she is developing knowledge of how to create the mechanics of something so that they can advise on policy when in fact there are many different cities that have tried to do the same thing that we’ve done and we might figure out how that fits. She noted she would suggest as they move forward this may be something for them to consider. Chair Steel asked Member Jones if she is suggesting seeing a “Strategic Master Parks Plan” instead of a “Strategic Plan” to which Member Jones replied yes, a “Master Parks Plan” which would include strategic planning and comprehensive needs assessment. Chair Steel noted she could be wrong but she doesn’t think the Parks Plan usually includes the enterprise facilities because it’s looked at differently. Ms. Kattreh pointed out that she thinks they are arguing over semantics because she has seen different plans called different things but thinks it’s very important that you are specific about what it is that you want. For example, are you looking for a master plan like you’ve seen

for Countryside Park, where they are creating a more efficient facility or are they looking at something more general such as this is what you want to see at the park and this is how it relates to the recreation and sport programs as a whole. It could include enterprises or not include enterprises, it really is a scope that would be determined by you because all master plans are done differently and called different things so it depends on the scope you want to see so if there is something you want done in one year or in multiple phases you need to determine what the key points are that you will be looking for immediately in 2013.

Member Segreto stated that she is really weary of spending lots of money on a consultant for an independent study on master plans. She indicated that while she supports a strategic plan for them to understand and sort through what their strategy is for a five year period she is really not a proponent. She commented that in looking at the plan that was just circulated it's so full of just statistics that they will have yet another thing on the shelf and she has full confidence in Edina Parks staff to work with the strategic plan that the Park Board comes up with. She added they could use the money that they would spend on their planning process and put into their parks.

Member Jones indicated she thinks they need to clarify if they're looking at a five or ten year plan and what are the objectives. She agrees they need to begin with a comprehensive needs assessment and strategic plan and see where they go from there. Chair Steel responded she thinks they are getting a little ahead of themselves on whether they want a five year strategic plan that's going to cover these facilities and will have this level of detail because that is going to take some discussion.

Member Jones asked if they can look at adding anything to the Work Plan because she believes the City Council consensus was reached regarding the Grandview process on the following: Park Board to address community needs, use of public spaces, and specific building programming which would drive building design. Chair Steel responded that she has included that under the Strategic Plan under rationale it states "Park Board has shown interest in needs assessment including but limited to nature programming, winters activities and then the Grandview Community Center programming/amenities". She stated that by making sure they do a needs assessment they are including all of the items that are coming up. Member Jones stated that she sees the target completion date is "ongoing" so this is a small area plan where the City Council would like to have some guidance so that they can develop that area. Therefore, she would recommend that they get a target completion date because it appears the Park Board is to address the community needs, the use of public spaces and civic building programming which would drive the building design. Member Jones stated she thinks that they would need either to have that as a separate item under the work plan or just a target completion date for the needs assessment. Member Deeds asked if we want Grandview cut out as a separate item because you think it's more eminent time wise. Member Jones replied maybe and maybe the City Council will say it's not, she would just like some clarity. Chair Steel noted that she is hesitant and it depends if they decide to do an internal needs assessment or not.

Member Deeds suggested they ask the City Council for some guidance on what their time frame looks like for Grandview. Ms. Kattreh indicated that the September 19th meeting has a work session and if Park Board would like to add Grandview then she would suggest adding it as a new initiative if you would like to give them some verbiage for that. The City Council can then decide whether they want to keep it or choose to eliminate it.

Chair Steel indicated that her only reservation about adding it as a separate item is because she doesn't want to spend money on a needs assessment and then do another needs assessment. Member Jones replied she thinks that was quite clear that they are looking at consolidating and potentially what it is that they might need in that space and how it might all fit together in a comprehensive needs assessment. She would never recommend there be more than one needs assessment. Chair Steel asked would it be sufficient under rationale to write "address" and then the language "City Council's action" to which Member Jones replied she thinks that would be great.

Member Dan Peterson indicated that he believes a few weeks ago the City Council copied emails to the Park Board regarding community gardens and noted that two or three years ago he tried to get the Park Board interested in that issue and there was no interest. He stated they are the only city in the western suburbs that does not have a community garden. He commented that the easy way to get going on it is to see where the need would be the greatest and that is around Centennial Lakes with all of the apartments and condominiums. He noted that he thought the YMCA has some land which Mr. Keprios thought could be used just across York. He commented if staff could figure out what's going on at the YMCA and let the Park Board know in the next couple of months. Chair Steel asked Ms. Kattreh what the City Council has done recently as far as community gardens. Ms. Kattreh replied there have been some discussions particularly related to "Do Town" about community gardens but they haven't received any specific directives.

Member Jones commented that she agrees that keeps coming up and most likely is going to be part of a needs assessment. She asked are they really going to say the needs assessment is going to take place this year and they will move forward with it next year. She stated that she thinks it's worth discussing whether or not they want to try to move faster on this. She noted that she is a little surprised this hasn't ended up in their work plan because there seems to be many initiatives that weren't even part of their CIP last year and not even part of the five year CIP and she feels very reactionary. Member Hulbert indicated that he thinks they always have the ability to add things as the year progresses, he thinks they always have flexibility if the time would permit. Chair Steel suggested adding it under "Other Work Plan Ideas".

Chair Steel informed the Park Board that she agrees with Member Jones about the CIP items and she also had the same conversation with staff but some of the items are already supported by City Council. Member Jones commented that she is very excited about some of the things they have added but does get a little frustrated because it seems as if they are constantly reacting to the next thing to which Chair Steel replied she feels the same way.

Member Jones informed the Park Board of one more idea she had and that is to talk about Green Energy and try to add that to the work plan. She explained that other cities are becoming very active in working with third parties and/or creating solar community gardens which would work for a community like Edina. She pointed out Minneapolis has been able to save \$14,000 a year in electricity and considering what their arena burns in electricity she would like to at least evaluate some other methods of green energy. Member Segreto asked if it would be more appropriate for the Energy and Environment Commission to work on to which Member Jones replied she thinks it would be a great thing for them to work together on and the savings could go towards the parks. Member Segreto commented that programmatically should they not be the spear leader on the effort. Member Jones replied she is just saying if it's parkland, then it is something that she thinks they should be involved in and maybe they could suggest a joint work group. Member Jones pointed out that when looking at reducing cost for the enterprise facilities and when they look at how much energy is burned heating the ice arena, etc., none of their work plan programs have really tried to target a reduction in cost.

Strategic Planning With a Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Member Jones made a motion, seconded by Member Deeds, to accept the initiative "Strategic Planning with a Comprehensive Needs Assessment" and add under rationale "address City Council's actions on the Grandview Area Plan".

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto, Steel, Deeds, Gieseke, Jones, Kathryn Peterson
Motion Carried.

Edina Senior Center Study

Chair Steel commented that Member Jones made the suggestion to add "Parking" under proposed changes on the Park Board duties.

Member Dan Peterson indicated he does not understand why it is on the agenda because it seems to him it is not broken. Member Deeds replied that they discussed last year that the utilization is extremely low as well as have very low utilization rates and the cost that they are running relative to utilization is quite high. Therefore, he thinks there is a good indication that they need to figure out a better use for the space and believes that is the rationale for it, there is good evidence that it needs to be looked at. Member Jacobson commented that she wishes it would state that in the Park Board duties because it sounds more like it's trying to look at the Senior Center as a whole and not utilizing the capacity or the potential income for the building.

Member Jacobson made a motion, seconded by Hulbert to add the statement of “increase the utilization of the building”.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto, Steel, Deeds, Gieseke, Jones, Kathryn Peterson
Motion carried.

Member Deeds made a motion, seconded by Member Gieseke to approve the initiative itself.

Member Jones stated she is trying to figure out how many working groups they are assigning themselves right now; she would like to get a tally of what is ongoing and what they have just approved. She added they need to be clear and a good thing about creating a work plan is now they will be intentional about what they ask each other to do. She noted they have the “Sports Dome Committee” that is going to continue work this year and asked if there are any others that are ongoing. Member Deeds asked about the “Naming and Donations” to which Member Jones replied they are pretty much done, there is one more meeting. Member Jones stated they have the Sports Dome and the Senior Center and asked if the “strategic planning” is going to be a working group to which Chair Steel replied no; that will be the full Park Board. Member Deeds commented that is going to be a lot of working groups and would guess will take anywhere from one to three years because if you do a good job on a strategic plan it will take a lot of time, energy, effort and a lot of data collection. They are not going to be able to do it as one massive board so there is a lot under that one initiative there. Member Jones commented that she thinks that alone will be a board task.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto, Steel, Deeds, Gieseke, Jones, Kathryn Peterson
Motion carried.

Cost Recovery Goals for Enterprise Facilities

There was a suggestion to add in criteria for classification.

Member Hulbert made a motion, seconded by Member Dan Peterson to approve the initiative Cost Recovery Goals for Enterprise Facilities.

Member Deeds indicated as they start stacking up what they are putting forward as initiatives for 2013 that's a lot of work. He knows this probably needs to be done but these are some big projects and asked is this a 2013 project or a 2014 project. Member Kathryn Peterson suggested they push out the completion date. Member Deeds commented that he thinks they need to think about prioritization a little bit because they all have jobs and lives. Chair Steel asked is there a preferred completion date.

Member Dan Peterson stated that he thinks this is a very important study and he doesn't see the economy getting any better for anyone quickly and feels the City Council is going to have to come to grips with can we afford to do this stuff that doesn't pay their own way. He suggested they all give it some thought and let Ms. Kattreh or Mr. Keprios know what we think should be the elements of the study and put that in writing and then talk about it in three or four months. He asked is this something that needs to be done in the next 12 months. Member Kathryn Peterson suggested making the completion date June of 2014.

Member Kathryn Peterson made an amendment to the motion, seconded by Member Hulbert, to change the completion date to June 2014.

Amendment Ayes: Dan Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto, Steel, Deeds, Gieseke, Jones, Kathryn Peterson

Amendment carried.

Motion to approve the initiative.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto, Steel, Deeds, Gieseke, Jones, Kathryn Peterson

Motion carried.

Renovate Garden Park Baseball Field

Member Deeds made a motion, seconded by Member Hulbert, to approve the initiative to renovate Garden Park Baseball Field.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto, Steel, Deeds, Gieseke, Jones, Kathryn Peterson

Motion carried.

Barrier Free Replacement Playground Equipment – Wooddale Park

Member Kathryn Peterson asked if this is strictly for the replacement of the tot lot area as opposed to any other improvements or changes to the park to which Ms. Kattreh replied that is correct.

Member Jones stated there are many playgrounds that are quite old and there is a replacement schedule for those and asked if this is when it would normally be replaced or are they moving ahead of others. Ms. Kattreh replied it is moving approximately eight years ahead of the normal replacement schedule which is why they are asking for the fundraising campaign. Member Jones asked if it is similar to the “Hornet’s Nest” that unless a certain amount of funds are raised the City will not replace it ahead of time. Ms. Kattreh replied that is correct but they have not yet had those discussions or a recommendation from the Park Board or City Council to say they need to raise 100% and she is hoping to get some involvement from the Park Board to help with that but at this point they are hoping for a 100% contribution in fundraising.

Member Kathryn Peterson asked in the context of providing a barrier free playground has there been any discussion about which park might be best suited to do that. Ms. Kattreh replied those are some discussions they’ve had with the neighbors and as staff. She pointed out that at this point because of the proximity to the home of the person that is spearheading this campaign Wooddale Park is the primary focus. She noted they did discuss other parks in Edina and it might be something that with the involvement with the Park Board they may want to do at other park locations as well.

Member Deeds asked if they currently have any barrier free playground places or is this a new addition to which Ms. Kattreh replied this would be a new addition to the playgrounds in Edina; there currently is no completely barrier free playground equipment in Edina.

Member Kathryn Peterson asked if barrier free parks will bring in people from outside the city and might there be parking issues as a result. Ms. Kattreh replied those are some discussions that they’ve had and thinks they would see people coming in from outside Edina but they definitely want to keep the neighborhood park feel and don’t want to overrun the parking or the neighborhood so they are definitely going to keep it at a scale that will be very reasonable for that park.

Member Jones indicated that this is the first time she has heard of this project and it sounds like a wonderful project but if this passes as part of the work plan does that mean it’s part of the CIP budget. Ms. Kattreh replied they did put a dollar amount in the CIP budget that you will be looking at and the City Council will have an opportunity to approve later in the year. Ms. Kattreh commented that Member Jones talked about being reactionary at times and as staff they also feel that they are being very reactionary but she tries to look at that in a positive mode. She noted they listen to what the residents are

asking for and they hope to be able to act and respond in a timely manner. In this case where they have someone that might be looking at making a \$200,000 or \$300,000 donation to improve a park eight to ten years ahead of time may be viewed as reactionary but as staff they look at it as they are trying to be proactive to what the residents are requesting.

Chair Steel pointed out that they want to be careful when they are wording their initiatives that they are not approving the specific project they are just getting it on their calendar. Ms. Kattreh commented that to completely answer Member Jones question you are not approving a dollar amount and in this case they put a \$300,000 budget just to give an idea of what they think the entire project might cost but believes they put \$100,000 in the CIP for the project but are thinking the whole project may cost \$300,000.

Member Deeds commented that he would like to speak in favor of putting this on because he thinks with the improvement and barrier free that is being talked about it is going to become an ADA issue and thinks you are either going to need to do it or get sued because it's going to become an access issue and they might as well be in front of it.

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Deeds, to approve the initiative Barrier Free Replacement Playground Equipment at Wooddale Park.

Member Jones made an amendment to the motion, seconded by Member Hulbert, to add "Park Board will be asked to review and comment on design and hold standard public notice".

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto, Steel, Deeds, Gieseke, Jones, Kathryn Peterson
Amendment carried.

Motion to approve Initiative

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto, Steel, Deeds, Gieseke, Jones, Kathryn Peterson
Motion carried.

Lake Edina Pathway

Member Segreto made a motion, seconded by Member Gieseke, to approve the initiative Lake Edina Pathway as one of the 2013 new initiatives.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto, Steel, Deeds, Gieseke, Jones, Kathryn Peterson
Motion carried.

Countryside Park Master Plan

Member Segreto made a motion, seconded by Member Dan Peterson, to approve the initiative Countryside Park Master Plan as one of the 2013 new initiatives.

Member Dan Peterson asked staff to give some thought to what percentage of new playground equipment should be barrier free and to let them know at a future meeting. Ms. Kattreh replied this is going to be their first playground that they are going to be putting in a completely poured in place safety surface so that it will be 100% accessible.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto, Steel, Deeds, Gieseke, Jones, Kathryn Peterson
Motion carried.

Ongoing Responsibilities

Chair Steel identified the "Ongoing Responsibilities" are: CIP, fees and charges, operating budget, bylaws, election of officers and the work plan.

Member Deeds made a motion, seconded by Member Hulbert, to approve the Ongoing Responsibilities.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto, Steel, Deeds, Gieseke, Jones, Kathryn Peterson
Motion carried.

Creating a New Category

Chair Steel indicated they talked about creating a new category “Ongoing Initiatives” which would include: Donations and Naming of Parks and Facilities Policy, User Fee Policy, Edina Veterans Memorial and Sports Dome.

Member Deeds made a motion, seconded by Member Gieseke, to approve the “Ongoing Initiatives”.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto, Steel, Deeds, Gieseke, Jones, Kathryn Peterson
Motion carried.

Other Work Plan Ideas Considered for Current Year or Future Years

Ms. Kattreh explained both Creek Valley School and Cornelia School have property lines that are unusual because there is school use on city property and there is city use of ball fields on school property. Historically this has been a handshake agreement but they would like to firm up these relationships in a more formal agreement so they know what is going on, what they can and cannot do, as well as possibly discuss field improvements and those sorts of things.

Member Deeds made a motion, seconded by Member Dan Peterson, to approve the Cooperative Agreement with School District for use, upgrade and maintenance of Creek Valley Park athletic fields and Cornelia School Park athletic fields.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto, Steel, Deeds, Gieseke, Jones, Kathryn Peterson
Motion carried.

Master Parks Plan

Member Segreto stated she thinks they are all in agreement and they just passed that the Strategic Planning would be part of the “2013 New Initiative” on the work plan; however, she wants to make sure they are not trying to create what was just handed out. She thinks Ms. Kattreh said it perfectly that it could be a matter of semantics so she is not in favor of that kind of planning, it’s overwhelming. Chair Steel explained that the rationale behind this is the City Council expressed interest in a Masters Parks Plan. Member Segreto suggested they should wait until the City Council gives them an official direction if that is what they want them to do.

Member Jones stated she has a separate opinion on this. She explained they have a schedule so they are able to tell neighborhoods that in so many years they are going to get a new swing set and this is the type of strategic planning; however, the Master Parks Plan is a little more detailed and feels it is something Edina could use.

Member Hulbert indicated that his impression of what Member Jones handed out was different than what the Master Parks Plan is that the Park Board is being asked to approve. Chair Steel stated that she really thinks it comes down to what you make it. Member Deeds commented that he thinks what they are talking about is if they put a strategic plan together it’s going to set forth goals, visions and what it is they think Edina should have in terms of amenities, etc., going forward over the next decade. He noted the Master Parks Plan then follows as the implementation. How is it they are going to achieve these goals; specifically what are they going to do with the parks they have as well as what new things are needed and it begins to go into more detail. Member Deeds pointed out that the only challenge with this is you have to have the first one done well before they can do the second one.

Member Dan Peterson commented that he thinks they need further background with what the City Council is thinking about.

New Items Suggested

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Hulbert, to put Community Gardens on the agenda.

Member Hulbert indicated that he thought there was some potential land use around the YMCA that could potentially be used for a community garden and thinks a lot of people would like it and so if it is a possibility he would like to see it explored.

Member Deeds asked what is specifically being proposed; is it proposing a working group? Member Hulbert replied he thinks it should be on the “Ongoing Responsibilities” and have staff give updates as to what is going on with the land by the YMCA. In addition, see if there is a possibility they could enter into an agreement so they could have a discussion as to whether or not it would be feasible to put in a community garden. Member Dan Peterson suggested they put this on their November agenda because Mr. Keprios will be back and he can give them the current status.

Chair Steel made an amendment to the motion, seconded by Member Segreto, to include this item under “Other Work Plan ideas”. Member Dan Peterson accepted the friendly motion so they could vote once.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto, Steel, Deeds, Gieseke, Jones, Kathryn Peterson
Motion carried.

Member Jones commented that she has been thinking about what Member Segreto has said about Energy and Environment and so her motion would be that she would suggest that they put it under “Other Work Plan Ideas” considered for current year or future year and suggest that they somehow ask the Energy and Environment Commission if they would be willing to co-chair a work group to pursue that.

Member Jones made a motion, seconded by Member Deeds, to add a working group with the Edina Energy and Environment Commission to talk about green energy assessment and implementation in the parks.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto, Steel, Deeds, Gieseke, Jones, Kathryn Peterson
Motion carried.

VIII. WELCOME NEW STUDENT MEMBER –

Chair Steel welcomed the new student, John O’Leary, who then gave the Park Board some information about himself.

IX. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS

Ms. Kattreh indicated there is one letter that has been placed in front of the Park Board members.

X. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Member Jones informed the Park Board that the City Council did hear the Naming and Donations Policy because they basically said it was something that was too complicated to take into consideration during a meeting and would prefer to discuss it at the December work session.

Chair Steel informed the Park Board that she presented the User Fee Policy to the City Council and they pretty much accepted the recommendations in the interest of collecting data, and they may take another look at it.

Member Deeds asked where they stand on the Sports Dome location. Ms. Kattreh replied they have been working with Creek Valley Church and have had discussions on their site and thinks at this point they have enough information to be able to report back to the group so she will be scheduling a meeting soon.

Member Hulbert commented that in regards to the letter they received regarding adding baskets for disc golf he would ask that staff touch base with Tom Horwath, City Forester, first because it does scar up those old trees and is not sure what it will do to the health of those old trees. Ms. Kattreh replied that does bring up another point in that they receive requests like this on a regular basis and Mr. Keprios and she had talked about wanting the Park Board to come up with a very specific policy and procedure on how they would like staff to address these concerns. She noted even if there was a policy on the website where if someone has a request or there is something they would like to see in the park that there is paperwork that would need to be filled out, there is a petition that needs to be signed and explain the process that will need to be gone through with the Park Board. This is something they would like the Park Board to consider.

XI. STAFF COMMENTS

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that in front of them is a resolution that they will pass on to the City Council next week as part of their Hennepin County Youth Sports Grant. She explained that they need to have the City Council pass this resolution which essentially states they have the ability to staff and the funding to be able to maintain the field at Garden Park that they are requesting funds for.

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that the Hornet's Nest project is moving along very smoothly and they are still on track for an early December opening date.

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that regarding the golf dome they are working with RJM as a construction manager and they are in the process of determining what they need in a new golf dome and they are putting together some figures. She explained once they have a building plan and some figures in place they will go back to the insurance company to work on negotiating those fees. She stated that they are not going to be able to have the golf dome open for this golf season but that the opening date is anticipated for October of 2013.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 pm